ANTHONY GIAMBRONE

Sacramental Charity, Creditor Christology, and the Economy of Salvation in Luke's Gospel

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
439

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

439

Anthony Giambrone

Sacramental Charity, Creditor Christology, and the Economy of Salvation in Luke's Gospel

Mohr Siebeck

ANTHONY GIAMBRONE, born 1977; PhD from University of Notre Dame; 2013–14 instructor in theology at the University of Notre Dame; 2015 assistant professor of New Testament at the Dominican House of Studies in Washington, DC; currently professor of New Testament at the École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-155170-3
ISBN 978-3-16-154859-8
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To the brothers
of the *École biblique de Jérusalem*

Preface

The appearance of several books and articles directly pertinent to the theme of this study, all within the past several months, confirms the considerable interest that the subject of almsgiving presently commands in scholarly circles. It confirms as well the difficulty of staying current. If the aspiration to keep pace with an ever-developing field must be resigned the moment a manuscript hits the press, I found it fitting, nonetheless, to take some account of these most recent studies and make the present work as up-to-date as possible. This effort represents the principal difference between the text presented here and the manuscript of my doctoral dissertation, defended at the University of Notre Dame in 2015.

Fortunately, nothing in the latest scholarship makes the research undertaken here redundant. On the contrary, I feel confirmed in thinking that this study offers a distinct perspective and a genuine contribution. The most substantial among the new studies and the one with which I have most actively engaged is David Downs' volume, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity,* a major survey that has certainly displaced Roman Garrison's earlier monograph on the same theme. The distance Downs takes from his predecessor aligns him in several places with my own critique, and we are clearly agreed on the fundamental importance of charity within the early Christian context. Still, it is evident that on multiple points Downs' approach and my own also indulge different perspectives and presuppositions. Such divergences range from the philological to the theological and are not without real consequence. Undoubtedly, integrating the work of this significant interlocutor has enriched the discussion in the following pages.

For all that, the dialogue with Downs remains limited and quite general. I have written a more detailed analysis of his work in the *Review of Biblical Literature*. As a study focused particularly on the question of atonement and covering a wide swath of textual evidence, Downs' book pursues a very different project than the one I propose. The Lukan passage of greatest interest in his framework is Luke 11:41, while the key parables examined here never figure within his treatment. Such neglect is typical, even of those authors concentrating exclusively on Luke. This is one of the basic justifications for the investigation offered here and is also responsible in some measure for the specific shape this study takes.

Before passing to the text itself and allowing the reader to discover a topic that is obviously energizing scholars, it is my obligation and my joy to give public acknowledgement to several people who played an important part in the preparation of this book. In the first place mention must be made of my director, Gary Anderson, whose fertile exegetical mind stands at the origin not only of my own dissertation, but also explains much of the interest in the theme of charity throughout the field. His always prompt and always positive guidance was a model of mentorship. Mention should also be made of my two additional readers, John Meier and Brian Daley, whose singular competence in their proper domains greatly enhanced my own formation and allowed my research to benefit from a uniquely well-rounded team of supervisors. My father, Albert Giambrone, and my sister, Gina Loehr, demonstrated their impressive patience in helping to proofread the long manuscript, as did Nicole Rüttgers who kindly checked the German. Benedict Vivano, OP, was likewise helpful in offering comments on several chapters. My confreres, Raphael Salzillo, OP, and Bruno Shah, OP, gave proof of heroic virtue in another way, in living with me during my period of writing. I would also like to express my gratitude to Paul Hellmeier, OP, and the other friars of St. Cajetan in Munich, where I spent two delightful summers in the course of writing this dissertation. In the final stage of preparation, Nina Heereman, with her uncommon generosity and customary charm, provided indispensible help in executing several very tiresome technical tasks, including the purgatorial labor of compiling the index. *Bleistift nahmen wir mit...* Finally, a word of thanks to Markus Bockmuehl, whose interest in my manuscript allowed it to be published in this excellent series.

Anthony Giambrone, O.P.
Jerusalem, Israel
September 14, 2016
Exaltatio Sanctae Crucis

Table of Contents

List of Abbrevations

AB	Anchor Bible
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AnB	Analecta biblica
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römische Welt*
AS	*Assyriological Studies*
A(Y)BRL	Anchor (Yale) Bible Reference Library
BAR	*Biblical Archeology Review*
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensum
Bib	*Biblica*
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BVC	*Bible et vie chrétienne*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur *ZAW*
BZNW	Beihefte zur *ZNW*
CB	*Cultura biblica*
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
CBQ	*CatholicBiblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly – Monograph Series
CC	*Corpus Christianorum*
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica, New Testament
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus scriptorium christianorum orientalium
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly*
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EHS.T	Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 23, Theologie
EKK	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses*
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quaterly*
ExpT	*Expository Times*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FBBS	Facet Books, Biblical Series
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*

HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HThKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HThKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	*Hervormde Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Int	*Interpretation*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Studies*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSJSup	*Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	Judea and Samaria Publication
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSQ	*Jewish Studies Quarterly*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LingBib	*Linguistica Biblica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplement Series
NRT	*La nouvelle revue théologique*
NTA	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das neue Testament Deutsch
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NRTh	*Nouvelle revue théologique*
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OLZ	*Orientalische Literaturzeitung*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studien*
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
RB	*Revue biblique*

RBL	*Review of Biblical Literature*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*
RivB	*Rivista biblica*
RThL	*Revue théologique de Louvain*
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSS	SBL Symposium Series
SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
Sem	*Semitica*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SHS	*Scripture & Hermeneutics Series*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
ST	Summa Theologica
ST	*Studia theologica*
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVTP	Studia in veteris testament pseudepigrapha
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
TGW	*Theologie der Gegenwart*
ThHKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TS	*Theological Studies*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westmintser Theological Journal*
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	*Word & World*
VC	*Vigilia Christiana*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNWKAK	*Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Introduction

Pope Leo, the great champion of christian charity, gave vivid form to the legend of Lawrence, the deacon martyr of Rome.

> The wicked persecutor… demands of the guileless guardian of the sanctuary that the church wealth on which his greedy mind was set should be brought to him. But the holy deacon showed him where he had them stored by pointing to the many troops of poor saints, in the feeding and clothing of whom he had a store of riches which he could not lose, and which were the more entirely safe that the money had been spent on so holy a cause (Sermon 85, *On the Feast of St. Lawrence*).[1]

It is true, both the explosion of Lawrence's cult and the earliest written sources about his life, Ambrose (*De officiis* 1.41.214–216), Prudentius (*Peristephanon* II) and the *Depositio Martyrum*, are fourth century phenomena. Nevertheless, the mortal jest attributed to the deacon about the Church's wealth being hidden in the poor stands in perfect conformity with the most primitive ecclesial praxis and tradition. Head of the city's seven deacons and entrusted with the distribution of the community's goods,[2] Lawrence's assimiliation to the proto-martyr, Stephen, reveals an embodied ecclesial exegesis of the Acts of the Apostles, dating from the middle two-hundreds. Behind the rhetoric of Leo thus lurks a tradition of Lawrence's lived testimony, and behind the behavior of Lawrence stands the textual witness of Luke.

A consequence follows. While Peter Brown and others have chronicled the impressive manner in which the great bishops of the high patristic period set about rhetorically lionizing Christian almsdeeds, one must be prepared to reach back behind the triumphant post-Constantinian Church, and even

---

[1] The original text may be found in CC 138a, 535–6. The translation is taken from *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Series 2, Volume 12: Leo the Great, Gregory the Great* (Philip Schaf and Henry Wace, eds.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012) 197.

[2] From contemporary sources one may be effectively certain that Lawrence served these functions, as later remembered in the legends. Pope Cornelius' letter to his Antiochene colleague, dating to the year 251, seven years before Lawrence's death in the Valerian persecution of 258, catalogues the 254 clerics of the Roman Church, including seven deacons and seven sub-deacons. The charitable duties of the deacons of the period are also clear, e.g., from the letter of Cyprian to the same pope, accusing the deacon Nicostratus of having defrauded the orphans and widows and robbing the Church (*Ep*. 44, *Ad Cornelium*).

behind the period of the Valerian and prior persecutions, expecting to find in the New Testament itself more than just retroactivated proof texts. Indeed, one must suppose a substantial cultural continuity in the matter of charity towards the poor – aware that the Gospels themselves neither emerge from nor recede into a vacuum. An important new line of research is, in fact, beginning to show that the New Testament vision of almsgiving belongs squarely within a cohesive, antique, religious worldview, rooted in the distant soil of later post-exilic Judaism and flowering brilliantly in both rabbinic and patristic contexts.

This monograph investigates the way such Jewish charity discourse is appropriated and developed in Luke's Gospel. In contrast to previous scholarship, neither the coherence of Lukan "wealth ethics" nor its contemporary actualization defines the study. Instead, the sacramental significance of almsgiving during the Second Temple period, recently brought to light in the work of Gary Anderson, becomes the starting point for a more theologically oriented exegesis. The end result recognizes Luke's "Christological mutation" of the inherited tradition.

The study is organized around three large exegetical probes, each handling parabolic material overlooked or unsatisfactorily treated by earlier scholars: i.e. Luke 7:36–50; 10:25–37; and 16:1–31. Without intending to neglect the importance of social history – the context of early Christian *praxis* is very consciously borne in mind – this focus upon the parable texts is a deliberate decision, designed to sensitize Lukan studies to the specific literary character of the Third Gospel's charity traditions. Luke's diegetic style has various distinctive elements, but it is in a special way marked by his historiographical affinities and parabolic virtuosity. The former touches Lukan charity traditions in various appreciable ways, notably in Acts, but it is his parabolic discourse that is of particular interest in the Gospel. An approach to the parables is here advanced that highlights Christological allegory (*metalepsis*) as a Lukan narrative device. A break is thus implied with the dominant rationalist constructions of Luke's parabolic art and ethics, ultimately traceable to figures like Adolf Jülicher and the problematic views of religion (both Christian and Jewish) held by the tradition of scholarship he represents, so deeply rooted in the ideals of the Enlightenment. This calculated break introduces a new theological, i.e. Christological, element into the long-standing discussion of the Gospel's wealth texts.

Also in contrast to a dominant (not unrelated) trend in Lukan studies, stress is laid here upon the author's Jewish rather than Hellenistic context. Accordingly, to expose the distinctly Jewish character of Luke's charity theology, each of the three exegetical probes undertaken in this study centers upon a key Old Testament text and line of Second Temple reception closely linked to Luke: i.e. Isa 61:1–2 and 11Q13; Lev 19:18 and CD 6:20; and Prov 10:2 and Tobit. This plotting of Luke within a *Wirkungsgeschichte* also includes attention Matthew's Gospel and to late rabbinic and patristic traditions, as well, under the conviction that Luke's Gospel is most accurately viewed when positioned along an interpretative trajectory extending to include the Gospel's own reception and not terminating arbitrarily at the end of the first century, as though the entire, vast Judeo-Christian charity tradition were but a prolegomenon and footnote to the inscription of a canonical text.

The first of the three large exegetical probes seeks to ground Luke's substantially Jewish pattern of thought. Specifically, it demonstrates the Gospel's engagement with the foundational and pervasive Second Temple "sin as debt" metaphor. This entails a new reading of Luke 11:4 and overturns a problematic scholarly assumption rooted in Luke's supposedly Hellenistic orientation. Here a distinct Lukan motif, described as "Creditor Christology," is identified above all in the parable of the Two Debtors (7:36–50; cf. 12:57–59). In this connection, Luke's transmission of an implicit "Devil's Ransom" theology is also shown (4:16–30; cf. Isa 61:1–2; 11Q13).

A fresh interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan is proposed in the second exegetical chapter. As a key point of reference, the interpretation of Lev 19:18 as a text referring specifically to almsgiving is first uncovered in a neglected tradition from Qumran (CD 6:20). This is then used to reorient Luke 10:25–37 around charity. Such a perspective helpfully integrates the diverse motifs interpreters have found within the Lukan text, including the traditional Christological reading. At the same time, it gives meaning to the final verses of the parable, so often overlooked. Through the interaction of the Samartian and the Innkeeper and the line of credit there extended a different image is presented than is found in Luke 7:36–50, which one might even call a "*debtor* Christology." Though grafted upon the same ground metaphor of debt, the diversity of Luke's thought is thus brought to light.

The third and final exegetical probe pursues a contextualized reading of the parables of the "Unjust Steward" and Lazarus and the Rich Man (Luke 16:1–31). This effort means to disentangle the crux of the former through an allegorical narrative application, which exposes yet another variation on the "debt/sin" release motif. The intersection of resurrection and wealth imagery is here brought to light, and the deep and complex grammar of Luke's charity soteriology is explored. Specifically, while Luke deploys two distinct soteriological paradigms, i.e. salvation by works of mercy and salvation by divine election – two patterns that parallel the great Second Temple charity grammars of *repayment* and *remission* – deference in the Gospel is ceded to God's divine action. Nevertheless, Luke has modified a God-driven paradigm of apocalyptic dualism to include a place for repentance by the rich. In this way the evangelist breaks from the extremity of texts like *1 Enoch* and fuses together in a single broad vision the disparate models of divine predestination and human responsibility. All this is subsumed under a logic rooted in the economic soteriology of Prov 10:2 ("Almsgiving saves from death").

Such a rapid overview of the present project is meant only to help orient the reader and provide a condensed statement of the contents, for the text is long. In the following chapter an extensive history of research is offered that will position and present the book's argument in much more detail. Each of the three subsequent textual studies will also include a brief conclusion, summarizing the chapter's findings. At the end, a short final chapter will indicate how the exegetical results obtained in the body of the work might be theologically contextualized.

Chapter 1

Reading Luke on Charity

1.1 A Tour of Recent Scholarship

Recent research on wealth and poverty in Luke-Acts has been abundant, a testament at once to the sheer number of relevant texts and the wide diversity of perspectives they contain.[1] Unfortunately, this ample research has yielded less fruit than one might have wished. After fifty years of focused debate, basic questions remain unanswered.[2] Two specific questions, which represent the major preoccupations of the literature, concern the "coherence" of Luke's vision and his particular understanding of the "poor." Both themes, in different ways, represent *ethical* inquiries; and both themes, in different ways, have exposed the need to move beyond merely ethical readings.

1.1.1 Defining the Agenda

1.1.1.1 The Search for "Coherence"

Among the issues animating the study of Luke's view of wealth, much effort has been directed toward the task of determining what precise behavior(s) the Gospel recommends. What coherent framework organizes the variety of economic imperatives Luke records? Who should give how much, to whom, and why? Dispossession, common ownership, hospitality, and almsgiving are all evidently promoted. It is no great exaggeration to say that addressing this practical diversity has in many ways controlled this subfield of Lukan studies.

Hans-Joachim Degenhardt, whose redactional study of the wealth/poverty theme in Luke marks the beginning of most *Forschungsberichte* on the topic,

---

[1] For helpful overviews of the history of research, see John Donahue, "Two Decades of Research on the Rich and the Poor in Luke-Acts," in *Justice and the Holy: Essays in Honor of Walter Harrelson* (D. A. Knight and P. J. Paris, eds.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 129–44; and especially Thomas Phillips, "Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts," *CBR* 1 (2003) 231–69.

[2] "While there is almost universal agreement on the importance of possessions, there is no consensus on major issues of interpretation, nor any consistent perspective in Luke-Acts," Donahue, "Two Decades of Research," 135.

set the framework. He observed a basic textual datum and a problem.[3] He distinguished two distinct sets of Lukan texts and sought an organizing ethical vision to hold them together. On the one hand, Degenhardt identified passages demanding complete divestiture (Luke 14:33; 18:22) or at least radical acts of renunciation (3:11; 19:8). On the other hand, he ranged the texts which only required giving of alms (11:41; 12:33) or suggested the offering of hospitality (9:4–5; 10:5–8). Degenhardt's response was to reconcile the two counsels by applying these two different levels of moral instruction to two different groups of disciples. Thus, the inner group of "office holders" (*Amtsträger*), signified by the Greek word, μαθηταί, would be required to leave all their possessions behind, while the outer ring, the λαός, were only asked to practice generosity.

Degenhardt's simple solution has not been accepted as presented – his facile linguistic distinction does not hold up – but the tension in the text and the problem he set out have continued to agitate scholars. Though he did not take the witness of Acts into direct consideration, the "love communism" protrayed there (e.g. Acts 2:44–46; 4:32–35) quickly entered the discussion and intensified the problem with yet another model of Christian economic life. A variety of proposals, all addressing the same essential issue, have been made since Degenhardt's study, none gaining great support. Chrisopher Hays identifies four different types of solutions, which may be reviewed in quick order.[4]

(1) First, there are the *bi-vocational* solutions. These try in various ways to adjust and rehabilitate Degenhardt's original idea. Thus, for instance, Hans-Josef Klauck seeks to show that Luke leaves open a variety of vocational options in relation to poverty, just as celibacy was also only one option and not a binding condition for all disciples.[5] Kyoung-Jin Kim takes a different line and recasts Degenhardt's categories as applying to "itinerant" and "sedentary" disciples.[6]

---

[3] Hans-Joachim Degenhardt, *Lukas – Evangelist der Armen. Besitz und Besitzverzicht in den lukansichen Schriften. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 1965). Degenhardt wrote the first full monograph on the theme. François Bovon (*Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research* [Waco,TX: Baylor University, 2006] 442) traces the dawning interest in Luke's teachings on poverty and sharing goods to the more generalized studies of Albert Gélin, *Les pauvres de Yahvé* (Paris: Cerf, 1953) and Ernst Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu: Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1953).

[4] Christopher Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character* (WUNT II/275; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 3–23.

[5] Hans-Josef Klauck, "Die Armut der Jünger in der Sicht des Lukas," in *Gemeinde – Amt – Sakrament: Neutestamentliche Perspektiven* (Würzburg: Echter, 1989) 160–94.

[6] Kyoung-Jin Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* (JSNTSup 155; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998).

(2) The next set of scholars offer what Hays calls *interim solutions*. These proposals have been numerous and diverse. David Seccombe, for example, contends that the radical renunciation theme belongs only to the thematic framework of the Travel Narrative.[7] It thus functions as an expression of the need for the disciples to "die with Jesus," and belongs to a precise moment in his ministry – not beyond. Vincenzo Petracca, by contrast, while also seeing a temporal distinction separating the forms of economic behavior, draws a generational line between the eyewitnesses, called to radical renunciation, and the later disciples, like Barnabas and Paul, who adhered to another lighter discipline.[8] Brigitte Kahl propounds a similar theory, contrasting the radical commands of the Gospel (*Armenevangelium*) and the respectable Roman ethic in Acts (*Heidenevangelium*).[9] David Kraybill and D. M. Sweetland offer a sociological angle on this perpsective, suggesting a distinction between the rudimentary, enthusiastic phase and the secondary, institutionalized phase of religious movements.[10] Kyoshi Mineshige reveals what may ultimately stand behind the popularity of this interim idea, invoking Conzelmann's "division of the times" *Heilsgeschichte* schema to divide Luke's differing economic imperatives.[11]

(3) A third type of solution is sought at the level of *sources*. (An affinity with the interim solutions is evident.) Thus, Gerd Theissen connects the more stringent demands of the Gospel with his theory of primitive itinerant radicals, who served as tradents conveying Q material to Luke.[12] Wolfgang Stegemann, for his part, suggests that Luke transmits radical materials from an earlier period faithfully, despite the tension they cause with the softer message he crafts for his own affluent audience.[13] Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, finally, sifts the relevant texts through a redactional filter, linking Luke's strong denunciations of wealth with an Ebionite community in the early

---

[7] David Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (SNTU 6; Linz: Fuchs, 1982).

[8] Vincenzo Petracca, *Gott oder das Geld: die Besitzethik des Lukas* (TANZ 39; Tübingen: Francke, 2003).

[9] Brigitte Kahl, *Armenevangelium und Heidenevangelium: "Sola Scriptura" und die ökumenische Traditionsproblematik im Lichte von Väterkonflikt und Väterkonsensus bei Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1987).

[10] David Kraybill and D. M. Sweetland, "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 10 (1983) 215–39.

[11] Kyoshi Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas* (WUNT II/163; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

[12] Gerd Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum," *ZTK* 70 (1973) 245–75.

[13] Wolfgang Stegemann and Luise Schottroff, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986).

Church.[14] While the strict ethics of this constituency appears prominently in the Third Gospel, in Acts we find Luke's own more moderate vision expressed in his own voice and with a freer hand.

(4) The final type of solution is described as *personalist*. Luke Timothy Johnson is the only proponent Hays identifies.[15] Johnson's suggestion is that the variable disposition of wealth in Luke represents a measure of one's personal response to Jesus. Such literary symbolism functions within a broader narrative account Johnson styles as the story of "The Prophet and the People." More than the other explanations, this perspective allows the "incoherence" of Luke's ethic to stand. As Johnson memorably remarks: "Although Luke consistently talks about possessions, he does not talk about possessions consistently."

Hays himself recognizes that "after fifty years of intense discussion regarding the wealth ethic of Luke, scholarship has grown repetitive, with three dominant proposals washing ashore again and again on the seemingly eternal tide of monographs and articles": namely, the *bi-vocational, interim,* and *source.*[16] His own preference is for something between the bi-vocational and personalist approaches, recognizing that a diversity of counsels on wealth (beyond the binary options of divestiture and almsgiving) are present, but disagreeing with Johnson about Luke's ultimate inconsistency. Instead, Hays envisions an economic code wherein *everyone* must renounce all their wealth (Luke 14:33) – but in a way calibrated to their own particular vocational circumstance. "Renounce," in short, means different things for different people.

Whether Hays has satisfactorily concluded the debate begun by Degenhardt, it seems that the "coherence" question is exhausted. Here the real importance of Luke Timothy Johnson's study must be understood. Johnson's work fits awkwardly in Hays' framing of the history of research, because, simply enough, Johnson finds the search for an ethical system to be misconceieved.[17] Whether or not a total disinterest in the project can be entirely justified, it remains the case that Luke propounds a "narrative" (διήγησις), built from an at times disorganized deposit of pre-existing source

---

[14] Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Glaube und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

[15] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977).

[16] Hays, *Wealth Ethics*, 184.

[17] See especially Johnson's second book on the topic, *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011) 13–25, 29. Hays (*Wealth Ethics,* 7, 17) himself sees the "ground-breaking" importance, "unimpeachable" scholarship, and "remarkable" influence of Johnson's work. Nevertheless, he contends that Johnson's narrative approach presents no decisive critique against the casuistic "wealth ethics" model of research.

material; he does not compose a freshly conceived Greco-Roman moral treatise (διατριβαί). One should not, therefore, demand from the Gospel a systematic theological "coherence" unsuited to its literary form. Finding an ethical focus in Lukan thought is unobjectionable, but this must first be approached on the level of the Gospel story.

In this regard, one can welcome several studies of wealth in Luke with special sensitivity to his narration.[18] Unfortunately, these works tend to be theory heavy, which can limit both their accessibility and utility. The effort of Thomas Phillips, tied closely to the reader response method of Wolfgang Iser, is perhaps the most approachable and significant.[19] The problem, however, is less the method, than that in Phillips' interpretation, as James Metzger complains, "an overemphasis on consistency-building as a goal of the reading process ultimately cancels textual indeterminacy and ambiguity."[20] Phillips' study thus unwittingly reinforces a certain incompatability of narrative exegesis and the common search for ethical coherence. Metzger's own reader reponse study, while committed to an overstated post-modern hermeneutic of "indeterminancy" (and addressed to a contemporary ethical cause in "overconsumption"), helpfully challenges this artificial systematizing trend in the scholarship. As a counterpoint to Hays' pursuit of the coherence question, Metzger thus continues to turn the attention of scholarship in the direction that Johnson first pointed: toward the properly *literary* nature of Luke's wealth discourse. Indeed, Metzger has taken an important step beyond Johnson. Where Johnson critically stressed the emplotted nature of the material, Metzger has added a valuable new emphasis on its connection to the *parables*.[21] This is an important and as yet unexplored aspect of Luke's presentation of proper behavior with money and possessions.

1.1.1.2 Inventing the Poor (and Rich)

Who exactly are the "poor" in Luke's conception? At an earlier point, before Degendhardt's redactional study, the identity of "the poor" was more central to the discussion, while in recent times it has become characteristic of

---

[18] See, e.g., Hans-Georg Gradl, *Zwischen Arm und Reich: Das lukanische Doppelwerk in leserorientierter und textpragmatischer Perspektive* (Forschung zur Bibel 107; Würzburg; Echter Verlag, 2005); and James Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative* (Biblical Interpretation Series 88; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

[19] Thomas E. Phillips, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2001). See also Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1980).

[20] Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth*, 13.

[21] Ibid., 15–31. Metzger provides a good discussion of the Lukan parables, then proposes reading them through Jesus' announcement of liberation for the poor in the sermon in Luke 4:16–30.

liberationist approaches.[22] This development reflects an increasing preoccupation in the literature with ethical actualization.

The category of the "poor" in Luke's Gospel shows both economic and theological coloring. In a dissertation some years back, Thomas Hoyt pressed the literal, i.e. "real economic" connotations of the Lukan πτωχοί (e.g. Luke 4:18; 6:20; 7:22; 14:13, 21; 16:20, 22; 18:22; 19:8; 21:2–3).[23] Philip Esler similarly insists that the word be rendered "beggars," since the force "is eviscerated by the translation 'the poor.'"[24] Linguistically, Esler's radical interpretation of πτωχός is open to objection.[25] A variety of scholars have, nevertheless, stressed the same basic point, at times allowing a strong, even Marxist dialectic to shape Luke's portrayal.[26] Such ideological excess is shaded in different degrees, of course. Walter Pilgrim rightly sees "that the Jesus movement cannot be reduced to a sociological phenomenon."[27] He, nevertheless, still accepts the poor as "those who belong to the lowest social and economic level," and, while making some provision for a small priestly "middle sector" of society, puts a strong accent on the political, class struggle of rich and poor as the proper background for interpreting the Gospel.[28]

Recent work on the spectrum of wealth distribution in the ancient world has objected to a "binary tunnel vision" and forced more sociological nuance here than scholars of Hoyt's persuasion have typically allowed.[29] Peter

---

[22] See Hays, *Wealth Ethics*, 20–3.

[23] Thomas Hoyt, "The Poor in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. Dissertation; Duke University, 1975).

[24] Philip Esler, *Community and gospel in Luke-Acts: The social and political motivations of Lucan theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987) 164.

[25] See, e.g., the critique of Outi Lehtipuu, "The Rich, the Poor, and the Promise of an Eschatological Reward in the Gospel of Luke," in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World* (Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, Erik M. M. Eynikel, and Florentino García Martínez, eds.; JSJSup 143; Leiden: Brill, 2011) 244–5.

[26] Hays (*Wealth Ethics*, 16) lodges this complaint against Schotroff, Stegemann, Thiessen, and Horn. See Wolfgang Stegemann, *The Gospel and the Poor* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).

[27] Walter Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981) 39.

[28] Ibid., 160, cf. 39–56. Esler likewise detects class struggle (within the community) as a major force behind Luke's specific language.

[29] The phrase comes from Walter Scheidel, "Stratification, Deprivation, and Quality of Life," in *Poverty in the Roman World* (Margaret Atkins and Robin Osborne, eds.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2006) 40–59, here 54. The bare word πτωχός does not necessarily imply someone at or below subsistence level income: one of the abject poor who according to Justin Meggitt's irresponsible exaggeration comprised "over 99% of the Empire's population" (*Paul, Poverty, and the Survival of Rome* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998] 50, cf. 99). For a similar view, see Géza Alföldy, *Die römische Sozialgeschichte* (Wiesbaden: Steiner Franz, 1986). Binary treatments of the rich-poor divide have been very common, but not generally helpful. For a much more nuanced treatment of the multiple grades of poverty and wealth in the New Testament world, see Steven Friesen,

Brown, for instance, observes that "it is largely under the influence of Christian preaching that we tend to think of late Roman society as divided irrevocably between rich and poor and of the poor as living always in a state of abject poverty."[30] Even before the full patristic accomplishment of such "pauperizing" and "divitizing," however, the schematic class divison was well established. Luke's dualistic contrast of rich and poor, therefore – however attuned to real social conditions and the plight of the under*classes* – must be understood to be a stylized representation: not a naked description of economic life. The simplistic rhetorical contrast of elite and plebs was widely and unreflectively embedded in Greco-Roman literature (and even law).[31] Luke's language of rich and poor naturally reflects this presentation; yet it also resonates in another, more specifically scriptural direction.[32]

In this connection, David Seccombe is insistent that in the language of the "poor" Luke has a covenant category, not an economic profile in mind.[33] For Outi Lehtipuu, "the poor are ultimately the good and humble; the insiders who lead the right kind of life."[34] Warren Heard, among others, more concretely highlights the background of Isaiah 56–66, where "the author intended a deliberate *double entendre:* both 'humble' and 'poor.'"[35] Given Luke's double citation of Isaiah 61:1 (לבשר נוימע), the Isaianic echoes in πτωχός are hard to deny (e.g. Luke 4:18; 7:22; cf. 6:20).[36] One way or

"Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus," *JSNT* 26 (2004) 323–61; and Bruce Longenecker, "'The Least of These': Scaling Poverty in the Greco-Roman World," in *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) 36–59 and 317–32; also idem., "Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity," *JSNT* 31 (2009) 243–78.

[30] Brown, *Eye of a Needle*, 78; and on the existence of middling classes, idem., *Poverty and Leadership,* 49. See also the interesting study of Chirstian rhetorical depictions of poverty in Christel Freu, *Les Figures du pauvre dans le sources italiennes de l'antiquité tardive* (Études d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Ancienne; Paris: De Boccard, 2007).

[31] See, e.g., Greg Woolf, "Writing Poverty in Rome," in *Poverty in the Roman World,* 94. On the use of this dualistic contrast in Greco-Roman moralists, see Frederick Hauck, "πτωχός, πτωχεία, πτωχέυω," TDNT VI, 887. On the legal *honestiores-humiliores* dichotomy, see Rolf Rilinger, *Humiliores-Honestiores: Zu einer sozialen Dichotomie im Strafrecht der römischen Kaiserzeit* (München: Oldenberg, 1988).

[32] So, e.g., Lehtipuu, "Eschatological Reward," 245.

[33] Seccombe, *Possessions and Poor,* passim.

[34] Lehtipuu, "Eschatological Reward," 246.

[35] Warren Heard, "Luke's Attitude Toward the Rich and the Poor," *Trinity Journal* 9 (1988) 47–80, here 49. See also, e.g., A. R. C. Leaney, *Luke* (London: A&C Black, 1958) 135; and Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HThKNT 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 326–8.

[36] Mention can here be made of several scholars who believe that Luke had no special interest in poverty and riches, but simply repeated the emphasis of his sources. See espe-

another, the whole massive Old Testament interest in issues of wealth and poverty must inform Lukan perspectives on these themes.[37]

Although objections have been raised to the view that a special "theology of poverty" was actually developed through the Psalms and prophets,[38] there remain good reasons to follow Erich Zenger and Nobert Lohfink on this point.[39] And while Horn's thesis that Luke knows a primitive Christian (Ebionite) community called "the Poor" must be rejected,[40] the *Armenfrömmigkeit* at Qumran, notably in the Hodayoth, illustrates the basic proximity of this vision to Luke, whose Magnificat belongs to the same essential thought world.[41] The affinities of Luke's notion of the "poor" to that conception cultivated at Qumran are, indeed, striking.[42] George Nickelsburg implicitly showed this several decades ago in pointing to the strong

---

cially David Mealand, *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1981) 16–20. Against this problematic position, see Esler, *Community and gospel,* 164–9.

[37] The theme is immense, but for a helpful, systematic overview of Old Testament legal traditions on wealth and poverty, see David L. Baker, *Tight Fists or Open Hands? Wealth and Poverty in Old Testament Law* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

[38] See Johannes Un-Sok Ro, *Die sogennante "Armenfrömmigkeit" im nachexilischen Israel* (BZAW 322; Berlin: DeGruyter, 2002).

[39] See, e.g., Erich Zenger and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Selig, wer auf die Armen achtet' (Ps 41,2): Beobachtungen zur Gottesvolk-Theologie des ersten Davidpsalters," in *Volk Gottes, Gemeinde, und Gesellschaft* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1992) 21–50; and Norbert Lohfink, "Von der 'Anawim-Partei' zur 'Kirche der Armen': Die bibelwissenschaftliche Ahnentafel eines Hauptbegriffs der 'Theologie der Befreiung,'" *Bib* 67 (1986) 153–76; and idem., *Lobgesänge der Armen: Studien zum Magnifikat, den Hodajot von Qumran und einigen späten Psalmen* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 143; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1990) esp. 101–25.

[40] For an important rebuttal of the commonly repeated idea that the Christian *Urgemeinde* in Jerusalem was known as "the Poor," see Leander Keck, "The Poor Among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran," *ZNW* 57 (1966) 54–78; and Longenecker, *Remember the Poor,* 157–82. See also the critique of Hays, *Wealth Ethics*, 15.

[41] Lohfink, *Lobgesänge der Armen,* 13–37. On a proposed metaphorical use of poverty language to describe the inferiority of humans to the angels, see Benjamin Wold, "Metaphorical Poverty in '*Musar leMevin*,'" *JJS* 58 (2007) 140–53. Benjamin Wright III ("The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings from the Sixth Internations Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001* [John J. Collins, ed.; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004] 101–23) claims instead that poverty should mainly be understood in a strict economic sense.

[42] The Hodayoth are not strictly apocalyptic texts, but in many ways they operate within this assumed framework. See Carol Newsom, "Apocalyptic Subjects: Social Construction of the Self in the Qumran Hodayot," *JSP* 12 (2001) 3–35.

similarities in Rich-Poor rhetoric linking the Third Gospel and *1 Enoch* 92–105.[43]

The most important way Luke deploys the "poor" is in the motif of the Great Reversal ("bi-polar reversal"), an idea of inversion shared in common with the worldview of *1 Enoch* and other apocalyptic texts.[44] The Magnificat (Luke 1:42–55), the Lukan Blessings and Woes (6:21–26), and the story of Lazarus and the Rich Man (16:19–31) are of obvious significance here, though other texts reflect the same idea (cf. 2:34; 9:24; 13:30; 14:11; 17:33; 18:9–14).[45] It is significant, however, that, as Mineshige observed, Luke's Woes do not threaten the rich on account of their unethical deeds, as in *1 Enoch*, but rather for having already received their rewards in this life (πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν, Luke 6:24; cf. 6:25–26; 16:25).[46]

Though Mineshige does not recognize it, such an idea of "taking down one's balance" belongs directly to *treasure in heaven* logic.[47] This reveals that the grand metaphor of merit and sin as credit and debit has here intruded and reconfigured the Enochic apocalyptic framework. The significance of this merger must not be missed, for it represents a critical confluence of wisdom and apocalyptic motifs. Nickelsburg appreciates the particular distance of Luke's more moderated rich-poor dualism from the hardened form found in *1 Enoch* and remarks that "the sharp, condemnatory tone in *1 Enoch* 92 ff. is somewhat muted in Luke's openness to the possibility of the rich finding salvation through almsgiving, deeds of generosity, and perhaps the wholesale

---

[43] George Nickelsburg, "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgement in 1 Enoch 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke," *NTS* 25 (1979) 324–44; and "Revisiting the Rich and Poor in 1 Enoch 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke," in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck, eds.; JSJSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 547–71. The thesis of Aalen that Luke knew *1 Enoch* goes far beyond the evidence. While *1 Enoch* was presumably not composed by the community at Qumran, the book was valued there. On the significance of *1 Enoch* in the context of Qumran, see Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

[44] See John York, *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke* (JSNTSup 46; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991) 12–25. On the political aspects of Luke's reversal language, see Amanda Miller, *Rumors of Resistance: Status Reversal and Hidden Transcripts in the Gospel of Luke* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014).

[45] See, e.g, Leslie Hoppe, *Being Poor: A Biblical Study* (Good News Studies 20; Wilmington, DE; Michael Glazier, 1987) 153–60.

[46] Mineshige, *Besitzversicht und Almosen*, 30.

[47] See Eliezer Diamond, *Holy Men and Hunger Artists: Fasting and Asceticism in Rabbinic Culture* (New York: Oxford University, 2004), especially Chapter Two, "'The Principal Remains for the Next World': Delayed Gratification and Avoidance of Pleasure in Rabbinic Thought." See also Gary Anderson, *Charity: The Place of the Poor in the Biblical Tradition* (New Haven: Yale, 2013) 135.